DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 580 JC 870 322

AUTHOR Harper, Jane
TITLE Expansion of Instruction in Foreign Languages: A Report on the 1987 Language Development Workshop and Internship at Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus.
INSTITUTION Tarrant County Junior Coll., Hurst, TX. Northeast Campus.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 38p.; Funded by the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Proficiency; *Oral Language; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; *Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In response to the need of local schools for assistance in introducing language study at the elementary and junior high school level, Tarrant County (Texas) Junior College (TCJC), Northeast Campus, designed a 5-week program in language development and methodology for prospective teachers that was designed primarily to develop skills in oral language communication and contemporary instructional methodologies. A total of 21 instructors participated in the 1987 program, each completing both a workshop and internship. A number of factors were considered in the evaluation of the project, including the oral proficiency skills of the participants, their security and confidence in speaking the second language, and their acquisition of information about current methodologies and materials. Oral proficiency ratings increased among participants with skills initially at intermediate levels, though no one at the advanced levels made any measurable changes. Gains in perceived ability and confidence in speaking and listening comprehension, as well as gains in information on methodologies and materials, were demonstrated by participants at all skill levels. Information on workshop goals and objectives, grant funding, cooperating with local education agencies, participant recruitment, workshop and internship schedule and curriculum, participant characteristics, and program outcomes are included, along with an interest survey, promotional materials, and assessment forms and results. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283580

EXPANSION OF INSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES: A REPORT ON THE 1987 LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP AND INTERNSHIP AT TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

by
Jane Harper
Chair
Humanities Division
Tarrant County Jr. College Northeast Campus

August 1987

JC 870 322

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jane Harper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EXPANSION OF INSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES:

A REPORT ON THE 1987 LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP AND INTERNSHIP AT TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

Psycholinguistic research and common sense both tell us that the earlier a person begins to study a second language and the longer period of time that he or she spends in the study of the language the greater the possibility that the individual will gain a useful command of that language. At the current time in Texas, there are few language classes offered to students before their entrance into high school; there are exceedingly few opportunities for second language study in the elementary grades.

Research also indicates that, if students are to become proficient in a new language, they must hear the language extensively before attempting to speak it, they must receive accurate and comprehensible input, and they must feel secure enough to risk trying to produce language. Unfortunately, there are few teachers in elementary and junior high schools who are proficient enough in a second language to provide quality foreign language instruction needed by students at that level. Most teachers in those grades did not major in a foreign language; indeed, only a few have as many as four semesters of language courses on their transcript. Of those, most have never possessed good speaking skills; others have lost their oral proficiency while teaching other subjects; still others cannot provide a secure environment because of their own insecurity in speaking the language.

With the growing demand for foreign language instruction by parents of children of this age, a number of school districts are seeking ways of developing language proficiency in some of their teachers who can then provide foreign language instruction in their school systems. Since Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus has offered classes in French, German, and Spanish on the campus for children of ages four through twelve consistently during the last ten years, the administrations of these districts in the Fort Worth area are looking to the College for assistance in faculty development.

WORKSHOP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In response to the need in the local schools for assistance in developing ways to introduce language study in the elementary and junior high schools, TCJC Northeast Campus designed a five-week program in language development and methodology for prospective teachers. The workshop was intended primarily to develop skills in oral language communication and in contemporary instructional methodologies in teachers (1) who currently specialize in other teaching areas but have some education and/or experience in a second language and (2) who are interested in enhancing the international focus of their curriculum through the incorporation of foreign language and cultural information.

The Language Development had as the primary objectives that the participating teachers would:

1. Identify themselves as candidates in a survey instrument distributed throughout the school systems involved;
2. Improve their oral proficiency in the language that they had previously studied;
3. Increase their security and confidence in speaking the language;
4. Develop new skills in current foreign language instructional methodologies appropriate for young students, particularly in Total Physical Response and the Natural Approach;
5. Develop a repertoire of instructional activities and materials which encourage students' participation in class and interest in the language and culture;
6. Use the computer to generate instructional materials;
7. Develop ideas of ways to incorporate foreign languages and culture to expand the international focus of the other courses that they teach.

GRANT INFORMATION

TCJC acquired funding through the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II, to support this project. Monies were allocated for methodology specialists, for language development instructors, for oral proficiency interviewers in each language, for tuition and materials and travel stipends for participants, and for publicity and teaching supplies. A total of $23,154 was granted to TCJC for the project.

COOPERATING LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

The Cooperating Local Education Agency for the project was the Gifted Students Institute, located in Fort Worth, headed by Director June Cox. Four independent school districts - Fort Worth, Arlington, Birdville, and Cedar Hill - are currently working with the Gifted Students Institute in the Pyramid Project, a program for talented and gifted children in the elementary grades of these districts. One of the goals of the Pyramid Project is to provide instruction in foreign languages at the elementary school level. Due to the standard problems of budgetary constraints, full-day curriculum demands, lack of appropriate and necessary instructional materials, and inadequacy of training of faculty, no progress had been made toward this goal. With the encouragement of tuition stipends from GSI to teachers in the Pyramid Project schools, teachers from Fort Worth, Arlington, and Birdville districts enrolled in the workshop and internship.

Furthermore, Arlington ISD graciously provided an elementary school building for the model classes for children used for the internship. Eighteen sections (11 in Spanish, 4 in French, and 3 in German) were offered daily during a three-week period in the facility, taught by TCJC part-time instructors who were experienced in teaching languages for children and who teach regularly in the TCJC program of languages for children.

RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Once the project was funded by EESA, the first concern was the recruitment of local elementary and junior high school teachers who met the language qualifications for admission and who were willing to trade five weeks of their summer vacation for the opportunity to upgrade their language skills and to study current instructional methodology. An interest survey was distributed to all teachers at these instructional levels in Fort Worth, Arlington, and Birdville schools as partners in the Pyramid Project and to those in the Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District because of their proximity to the Northeast Campus. These schools also shared the information with private schools in the area. In addition, a second letter made a special appeal to teachers in schools identified by each district as enrolling large numbers of minority children. Both sets of letters resulted in inquiries and enrollments by interested teachers. (Copies of these documents are in Appendix A.)

Although twenty-seven teachers were admitted to the thirty funded positions in the workshop, only twenty-one of these teachers actually participated due to last-minute withdrawals of the others. Of these twenty-one, all of them completed the workshop and internship.

WORKSHOP AND INTERNSHIP SCHEDULE AND CURRICULUM

The workshop and internship were scheduled during a five-week period between June 8 and July 9, 1987. The workshop sessions were held on campus

at Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus. The internship classes were held at South Davis Elementary School in Arlington.

The following schedule was developed to provide intensive language development for three weeks and an observation internship for three weeks during the five-week period:

Week 1

9:00 - 12:00	The Natural Approach
1:00 - 4:00	Language Development

Week 2

9:00 - 12:00	Total Physical Response
1:00 - 4:00	Language Development

Week 3

9:00 - 12:00	Observation
1:00 - 4:00	Language Development

Week 4

9:00 - 12:00	Observation
1:00 - 4:00	Color Connection: A Method for Language Acquisition

Week 5

9:00 - 12:00	Observation
12:00 - 1:30	Closure Conference

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The twenty-one participants in the workshop and internship represented a variety of grade levels and ethnic groups, as indicated in the following tables:

TABLE I

GRADE LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS

Teaching Grades K - 5	18
Teaching Grades 6 - 9	11

Note: Several teachers teach across grade levels.

TABLE II

RACE/ETHNICITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	3	14%
Hispanic	3	14%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	
American Indian	0	
Anglo	15	72%

TABLE III

PUBLIC/PRIVATE SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Public Schools	16	76%
Private Schools	5	24%

In addition to the diversity of the teacher-participants themselves, the students in the schools which they serve also represent a broad cross-section of the population.

TABLE IV

RACE/ETHNICITY OF STUDENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	127	9%
Hispanic	227	16%
Asian or Pacific Islander	66	5%
American Indian	5	less than 1%
Anglo	966	69%

EVALUATION

A number of factors must be considered in the evaluation of the project, including the oral proficiency skills of the participants, their security and confidence in speaking their second language, and their acquisition of information about current methodologies and materials.

Oral Proficiency of the Participants

An Oral Proficiency Interview was conducted with each participant at the beginning and at the close of the Language Development Workshop. These interviews were conducted and evaluated by testers trained under the direction of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Dr. David Stout, pre- and post-tests in German; Dr. Francisco Perez, pre-

and post-tests in Spanish; Dr. Maurice Elton, pre-test, and Dr. Joan Manley, post-test, in French.

Of the twenty-one participants, twenty completed both the pre- and post-test oral interviews. (One participant in French did not do her post-test interview.) The examination of the data includes only those twenty samples.

The following table shows the Oral Proficiency ratings of the participants at the beginning and at the close of the Language Development Workshop:

TABLE V

ORAL INTERVIEW RATINGS OF PARTICIPANTS

	French		German		Spanish		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Novice Low	1*						1*	
Novice Mid	3				4	2	7	2
Novice High		3	1		2	4	6	7
Intermediate Low			1		2	1	3	1
Intermediate Mid				1	1	1	2	2
Intermediate High				1	2	3	3	4
Advanced					1	1	1	1
Advanced Plus					1	1	1	1
Superior	1	1			1	1	2	2

*This participant did not do the post-test interview.

Observations

1. With this sample, a positive change in oral proficiency skills occurred. The average rating increased from the mid point between Intermediate Low and Intermediate Mid to 80 percent past Intermediate Low toward Intermediate Mid.

2. With this sample, no one at the Advanced, Advanced Plus, or obviously, Superior levels made any measurable changes in level in oral proficiency.

3. If participants at the upper end of the scale - Advanced, Advanced Plus, and Superior - are excluded from the sample, the change is more marked, almost one full level from a pre-workshop level of near Novice High to a post-workshop level of near Intermediate Low.

4. Comments noted by the oral proficiency testers indicated that, while there were no measurable changes in proficiency level in some of the participants, several of them had "gained confidence" in their abilities, appeared "more enthusiastic" in their performance, "increased vocabulary" range, "reacted with greater accuracy" to questions, "understood more without undue repetition," all worthy achievements in language development and necessary preliminary steps for increasing their oral proficiency scores.

5. It is possible that individuals removed from active language usage over a long period of time, as was the case with most of the participants in this sample, may have a greater growth potential than current students or teachers who are regularly engaged in language practice since those former individuals may have latent language abilities that will not be evident in the initial interview. Additional studies are needed to make such determinations.

6. It is possible that participants at the Advanced and Advanced Plus levels might show more progress in oral proficiency development if Novice and Intermediate level speakers were not included in the same instructional group. Additional studies are needed to make such determinations.

7. The average level change in German was twice the average change in the other two groups, two levels rather than one. It is possible that with this very small group, only two participants with one instructor, such an increase in skill can be achieved. However, the sample is too small to make such a generalization. Furthermore, for these participants the interviewer was also the instructor. It is possible that a decrease in test-anxiety occurred in this situation, making possible the greater difference in score. Additional studies are needed to make such determinations.

Conclusions

1. In three weeks of language development work, three hours per day and four days per week, approximately one level change on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency scale is possible at the Novice and Intermediate levels.

2. Three weeks at twelve hours per week appear to be too short to effect a measurable change on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency scale at the Advanced and Superior levels in a mixed-level instructional group.

3. Gains in listening comprehension, vocabulary, confidence, and enthusiasm are possible achievements in three weeks at twelve hours per week and are appropriate goals for language development workshops.

Perceived Language Skills and Confidence of the Participants

While the actual change in oral proficiency skills of the participants is of primary importance in evaluating the success of the workshop and internship, the participants' perception of their listening comprehension and speaking skills is also of similar importance. One must have confidence in his/her ability to understand and to be understood before being willing to risk speaking. Therefore, one of the main objectives of the Language Development Workshop was to increase the

security and confidence of the participants in speaking their second language.

Table VI shows the average gains in confidence in each language and in the total group in speaking and in listening comprehension. The scores are based on a scale of 1 to 5. A copy of the document with pre- and post-workshop scores for each item is in Appendix B.

TABLE VI

CONFIDENCE IN LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

	French		German		Spanish		Total	
	Pre	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**
Speaking	2.27	3.79	1.91	3.68	2.91	3.26	2.65	3.39
Understanding	2.53	3.92	2.69	4.38	3.11	3.52	2.92	3.67

Observations

1. Much greater gains in perceived ability in both speaking and understanding were achieved by the participants in French (1.52 and 1.39 respectively) and in German (1.77 and 1.69) than by those in Spanish (.35 and .41). It is possible that the difference was the result of the difference in size of the groups (5 in French, 2 in German, and 14 in Spanish) since in the smaller groups each individual had more one-on-one attention

and opportunity to speak. Additional studies are needed to determine optimal group size.

2. Another possible factor in creating the disparity between the gains by the participants in French and German and those in Spanish is the greater diversity of ability levels in the Spanish group. Among the participants in Spanish, there were speakers rated on the Oral Proficiency pre-test at every level from Novice Mid through Superior. In French, with the exception of one Superior native speaker, the participants were all rated Novice Low or Novice Mid. In German they were rated Novice High and Intermediate Low. With participants at or near the same ability level, all instruction could be focused on functions appropriate for all learners. Additional studies are needed to determine optimal group composition.

Conclusions

1. Gains in perceived ability and confidence in speaking and listening comprehension were evidenced by participants in all three language groups during the Language Development Workshop.

2. Larger gains were shown by participants in French and German than by those in Spanish.

Development of Methodologies and Materials by the Participants

A third major set of objectives of the project centered around the development of new skills in current foreign language methodologies appropriate for young students, particularly in Total Physical Response and The Natural Approach, and the development of instructional activities and materials which encourage students' participation in class and interest in the language and culture.

Consultants Dr. Margaret Woodruff-Wieding in TPR and Carol Stacy in The Natural Approach directed the workshop activities during these segments. Pam Kaatz, author of the Color Connection materials, taught the instructional materials development segment.

Table VII shows the gains in information made by the participants in each of these instructional areas. The scores are based on a scale of 1 to 5. Appendix C contains the evaluation documents with the pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE VII

DEVELOPMENT OF METHODOLOGIES AND MATERIALS BY PARTICIPANTS

	Pre	Post	Change
TPR	2.07	4.45	2.38
Natural Approach	2.18	4.21	2.03
Color Connection	1.74	4.27	2.53

Observation

1. As a group these participants had little knowledge of current methodologies in foreign language instruction at the beginning of the workshop. Thus, they showed large gains in information. It is possible, but not certain, that practicing foreign language teachers might have begun the workshop with more background information in methodology.

Conclusion

1. The participants showed large gains in information in each of the segments on methodologies and materials: Total Physical Response, The Natural Approach, and Color Connection.

Additional Evaluations of the Project

In addition to the measurable outcomes and achievements based on pre- and post-workshop assessment instruments, other results of the project can be noted.

1. Nine of the twenty-one participants have expressed a desire to teach in the program of Languages for Children directed by the Department of Foreign Languages of Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus. Several of these teachers will be employed on

a part-time basis by the College during the fall semester, 1987, as instructors for these courses both in Arlington and on Northeast Campus itself.

2. Several of the participants have indicated their intention to continue to work on the development of their oral proficiency skills by enrolling in conversation and/or film classes in the language this fall, 1987, at Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus. These enrollments will intensify the results of the project and will increase the enrollment in the specialized courses for language teachers on the campus.

3. Several of the participants have indicated an interest in further training in language and methodology in the workshops scheduled on Northeast Campus during the summer, 1988.

4. The participants shared their home addresses and telephone numbers with the group, providing an opportunity for networking among themselves, thus creating a type of alliance across grade levels and disciplines.

5. The positive experience of the participants in the project will enlarge the group of professional "friends" of Tarrant County Junior College in the academic community of the area. These teachers can have a positive impact on the image of the College with their constituency of students and parents.

The activity which is the subject of this report was produced under a grant from the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System and the U.S. Education Department under the auspices of the Education for Economic Security Act (Title II).

Opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, or the U.S. Education Department, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

INTEREST SURVEY

FOREIGN LANGUAGE WORKSHOP AND INTERNSHIP

I am interested in the summer workshop and internship in foreign languages.

The language of interest to me is:

- ☐ French
- ☐ German
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Other Please name _____

My background in this language includes:

- ☐ 2 college semesters
- ☐ 3-4 college semesters
- ☐ More than 4 college semesters
- ☐ Other Please explain _____

I have used this language:

- ☐ at home
- ☐ at work
- ☐ in travel
- ☐ Other Please explain _____

Name _____

School _____

Teaching Assignment _____

School phone _____ Home phone _____

Return to Madeleine Lively, Chair, Department of Foreign Languages, Tarrant County Junior College.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus has received grant monies from Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act to support a five-week workshop for prospective teachers of foreign languages in elementary and junior high school, including an observation internship in its summer program of Languages for Children. This project is intended to develop skills in oral language communication and in contemporary instructional methodologies in teachers (1) who currently specialize in other teaching areas but have some education and/or experience in a second language and (2) who are interested in enhancing the international focus of their curriculum through the incorporation of foreign language and cultural information.

In addition, the College hopes to identify teachers who would be candidates for part-time teaching positions in an extended program of languages to be taught during after-school hours and summers in area elementary schools.

As approved, the grant will pay the $175 workshop tuition, a $100 travel stipend to each teacher/intern, and a $100 materials stipend toward the cost of instructional materials prepared and/or created by each teacher for use in the classroom.

The workshop schedule includes:

June 8 - June 11	9:00 - 12:00	Natural Approach
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 15 - June 18	9:00 - 12:00	Total Physical Response
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 22 - June 25	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 29 - July 2	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship
	1:00 - 4:00	Color Connection
July 6 - July 9	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship

The workshop will be taught at TCJC Northeast Campus. The internship will be in children's language classes offered by TCJC at South Davis Elementary School in Arlington.

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
NORTHEAST CAMPUS 828 HARWOOD ROAD • HURST, TEXAS 76054 • TELEPHONE 817-281-7860

May 25, 1987

Dear Colleague:

We are pleased to inform you that the proposed Language Development Workshop and Internship for elementary teachers has been funded by EESA Title II. Congratulations! You have been selected as a participant in this project based on your qualifications and interest. Enclosed please find a detailed description of the program, including a revised schedule, and an official registration form.

The registration form should be completed and returned immediately to the Office of Community Services to reserve your place. Our sessions will be held in the Instructional Media Center (IMC), room 115. Campus directories located near parking lots will direct you.

Our first class meeting will be at 9:00 a.m. Monday, June 8. We look forward to a stimulating summer program.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Lively

Madeleine Lively, Chair
Department of Foreign Languages

APPENDIX A
DEPARTMENT OF FORIEGN LANGUAGES
TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus has received grant monies from Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act to support a five-week workshop for prospective teachers of foreign languages in elementary and junior high school, including an observation internship in its summer program of Languages for Children. This project is intended to develop skills in oral language communication and in contemporary instructional methodologies in teachers (1) who currently specialize in other teaching areas but have some education and/or experience in a second language and (2) who are interested enhancing the international focus of their curriculum through the incorporation of foreign language and cultural information.

In addition, the College hopes to identify teachers who would be candidates for part-time teaching positions in an extended program of languages to be taught during after-school hours and summers in area elementary schools.

As approved, the grant will pay the $175 workshop tuition, a $100 travel stipend to each teacher/intern, and a $100 materials stipend toward the cost of instructional materials prepared and/or created by each teacher for use in the classroom.

The workshop schedule includes:

June 8 - June 11	9:00 - 12:00	Natural Approach
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 15 - June 18	9:00 - 12:00	Total Physical Response
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 22 - June 25	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship
	1:00 - 4:00	Language Development
June 29 - July 2	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship
	1:00 - 4:00	Color Connection
July 6 - July 9	9:00 - 12:00	Observation Internship

The workshop will be taught at TCJC Northeast Campus. The internship will be in children's language classes offered by TCJC at South Davis Elementary School in Arlington.

INTEREST SURVEY

FOREIGN LANGUAGE WORKSHOP AND INTERNSHIP

I am interested in the summer workshop and internship in foreign languages.

The language of interest to me is:

- ☐ French
- ☐ German
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Other Please name _____

My background in this language includes:

- ☐ 2 college semesters
- ☐ 3-4 college semesters
- ☐ More than 4 college semesters
- ☐ Other Please explain _____

I have used this language:

- ☐ at home
- ☐ at work
- ☐ in travel
- ☐ Other Please explain _____

Name _____

School _____

Teaching Assignment _____

School phone _____ Home phone _____

Return to Madeleine Lively, Chair, Department of Foreign Languages, Tarrant County Junior College.

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
NORTHEAST CAMPUS 828 HARWOOD ROAD • HURST, TEXAS 76054 • TELEPHONE 817-281-7860

May 25, 1987

Dear Colleague:

We are pleased to inform you that the proposed Language Development Workshop and Internship for elementary teachers has been funded by EESA Title II. Congratulations! You have been selected as a participant in this project based on your qualifications and interest. Enclosed please find a detailed description of the program, including a revised schedule, and an official registration form.

The registration form should be completed and returned immediately to the Office of Community Services to reserve your place. Our sessions will be held in the Instructional Media Center (IMC), room 115. Campus directories located near parking lots will direct you.

Our first class meeting will be at 9:00 a.m. Monday, June 8. We look forward to a stimulating summer program.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Lively

Madeleine Lively, Chair
Department of Foreign Languages

APPENDIX B

CONFIDENCE IN LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

ANALYSIS OF ITEMS

PRE-ASSESSMENT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	French	German	Spanish	Total
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	3.40	4.00	3.85	3.75
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	3.00	3.00	3.85	3.58
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	3.00	3.00	3.85	3.55
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	2.40	2.00	3.31	2.95
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	2.60	2.00	3.15	2.90
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	2.20	1.50	3.23	2.80
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	1.80	1.50	2.54	2.25
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	1.40	1.00	2.46	2.05
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	1.80	1.00	2.08	1.90
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	1.80	1.00	2.00	1.85
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.60	1.00	1.67	1.58
Speaking Average	2.27	1.91	2.91	2.65
UNDERSTANDING:				
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	3.20	3.50	4.15	3.85
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	3.20	3.50	3.85	3.65
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.00	3.00	3.62	3.40
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	2.60	2.50	3.08	2.90
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	2.40	2.50	3.00	2.80
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	2.20	2.50	2.54	2.45
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	2.00	3.00	2.77	2.60
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.60	1.00	1.85	1.70
Understanding Average	2.53	2.69	3.11	2.92

Name_____ Date_____

POST-ASSESSMENT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	French	German	Spanish	Total
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.00	4.50	4.21	4.22
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.33	4.50	4.21	4.26
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.00	4.50	4.14	4.16
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	3.67	4.00	3.57	3.63
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	4.33	4.00	3.57	3.74
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	4.00	4.50	3.29	3.53
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	4.00	4.50	2.93	3.26
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.67	3.00	2.79	2.95
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	3.67	3.00	2.50	2.74
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	3.00	2.00	2.36	2.42
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	3.00	2.00	2.31	2.39
Speaking Average	3.79	3.68	3.26	3.39
UNDERSTANDING:				
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.00	5.00	4.38	4.37
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.33	5.00	4.29	4.37
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	4.33	4.50	4.07	4.16
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	4.33	4.50	3.57	3.79
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	3.67	3.50	3.14	3.26
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.67	4.50	3.07	3.32
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	4.00	4.50	3.29	3.53
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	3.00	3.50	2.36	2.58
Understanding Average	3.92	4.38	3.52	3.67

Name _____ Date _____

FRENCH

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	FRENCH Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	3.40	4.00	0.60
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	3.00	4.33	1.33
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	3.00	4.00	1.00
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	2.40	3.67	1.27
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	2.60	4.33	1.80
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	2.20	4.00	1.80
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	1.80	4.00	1.20
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	1.40	3.67	2.27
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	1.80	3.67	1.87
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	1.80	3.00	1.20
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.60	3.00	1.40
Speaking Average	2.27	3.79	1.54
UNDERSTANDING:			
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	3.20	4.00	0.80
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	3.20	4.33	1.13
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.00	4.33	1.33
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	2.60	4.33	1.73
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	2.40	3.67	1.27
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	2.20	3.67	1.47
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	2.00	4.00	2.00
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.60	3.00	1.40
Understanding Average	2.53	3.92	1.39

Name _____ Date _____

GERMAN
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	German Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.00	4.50	0.50
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	3.00	4.50	1.50
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	3.00	4.50	1.50
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	2.00	4.00	2.00
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	2.00	4.00	2.00
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	1.50	4.50	3.00
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	1.50	4.50	3.00
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	1.00	3.00	2.00
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	1.00	3.00	2.00
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	1.00	2.00	1.00
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.00	2.00	1.00
Speaking Average	1.91	3.68	1.77
UNDERSTANDING:			
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	3.50	5.00	1.50
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	3.50	5.00	1.50
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.00	4.50	1.50
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	2.50	4.50	2.00
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	2.50	3.50	1.00
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	2.50	4.50	2.00
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.00	4.50	1.50
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.00	3.50	2.50
Understanding Average	2.69	4.38	1.69

Name _____ Date _____

SPANISH

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

	Spanish		
SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	3.85	4.21	0.36
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	3.85	4.21	0.36
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	3.85	4.14	0.29
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	3.31	3.57	0.26
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	3.15	3.57	0.42
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	3.23	3.29	0.06
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	2.54	2.93	0.39
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	2.46	2.79	0.33
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.08	2.50	0.42
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.00	2.36	0.36
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.67	2.31	0.64
Speaking Average	2.91	3.26	0.35
UNDERSTANDING:			
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.15	4.38	0.23
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	3.85	4.29	0.44
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.62	4.07	0.45
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	3.08	3.57	0.49
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	3.00	3.14	0.14
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	2.54	3.07	0.53
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	2.77	3.29	0.54
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.85	2.36	0.51
Understanding Average	3.11	3.52	0.41

Name _____ Date _____

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

Language: _____French _____German _____Spanish

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Total Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	3.75	4.22	0.47
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	3.58	4.26	0.68
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	3.55	4.16	0.61
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	2.95	3.63	0.73
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	2.90	3.74	0.84
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	2.80	3.53	0.73
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	2.25	3.26	1.01
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	2.05	2.95	0.90
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	1.90	2.74	0.84
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	1.85	2.42	0.57
11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.58	2.39	1.74
Speaking Average	2.65	3.39	0.74
UNDERSTANDING:			
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	3.85	4.37	0.52
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	3.65	4.37	0.72
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.40	4.16	0.76
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	2.90	3.79	0.89
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	2.80	3.26	0.46
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	2.45	3.32	0.87
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	2.60	3.53	0.93
19. Can understand technical discussions in academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	1.70	2.58	0.88
Understanding Average	2.92	3.67	0.75

Name _____ Date _____

APPENDIX C

ASSESSMENTS OF METHODOLOGY WORKSHOPS

Total Physical Response

The Natural Approach

Color Connection

Total Physical Response Approach

Please respond to each statement by circling an appropriate number.

A. Indicate your knowledge of the total physical response (TPR) approach to language learning.

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. The meaning of TPR	3.05	4.63	1.58
2. What can be taught with TPR	2.86	4.58	1.72
3. Comprehension before production	2.43	4.78	2.35
4. Communication vs. repetition	2.58	4.68	2.10
5. Global vs. local errors	1.81	4.47	2.66
6. Recycling vocabulary in novel variations	1.80	4.42	2.62

B. Indicate your knowledge of total physical response (TPR) technques.

1. Combination (serial) commands	1.95	4.68	2.73
2. Optimal sequence of TPR activities	1.62	4.16	2.21
3. Role of the native language	1.86	4.32	2.46
4. Varying TPR practice	1.67	4.21	2.54
5. Other activities for showing comprehension	1.67	4.47	2.80
6. How to create TPR lesson plans	1.48	3.95	2.47
Average	2.07	4.45	2.38

Signature _____ Date _____

THE NATURAL APPROACH

Please respond to each statement by circling an appropriate number.

A. Indicate your knowledge of and experience with foreign langauge methodologies:

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. The Natural Approach	1.95	4.37	2.42
2. Total Physical Response	2.19	4.47	2.28
3. Suggestopaedia	1.24	3.89	2.65
4. Listening Comprehension	2.48	4.26	1.78
5. Experience in teaching a FL	2.24	3.53	1.29
6. Parenting experience	2.20	3.95	1.75

B. Indicate your knowledge of natural-approach techniques:

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Listening activities	2.10	4.37	2.27
2. Creation of a nonthreatening classroom atmosphere with a positive learning environment:	3.50	4.63	1.13
3. Knowledge about the target culture and stereotypes which students might have:	2.20	4.22	2.02
4. How to create natural-approach materials:	1.71	4.22	2.51
Average	2.18	4.21	2.03

Signature _____ Date _____

COLOR CONNECTION WORKSHOP

I would rate my awareness of the following current Foreign Language teaching/learning theories/theorists as:

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. Piaget's reality	2.35	3.73	1.38
b. Hemisphericity (right-brained input)	2.53	4.69	2.16
c. Lazanov (super-learning)	1.41	3.81	2.40
d. Asher (TPR)	2.94	4.81	1.87
e. Winitz (comprehension)	1.24	4.06	2.82
f. Linear/Non-linear	1.65	4.19	2.54
g. Explicit/Implicit	1.06	4.44	2.38
h. Terrell/Krasher (natural approach)	1.82	4.69	2.87
i. Terrell (Binding Theory)	0.65	3.44	2.79
Average	1.74	4.21	2.47

I have increased my awareness of the following:

a. Piaget's reality	3.80
b. Hemisphericity	4.69
c. Lazanov	4.00
d. Asher	4.81
e. Winitz	4.13
f. Linear/Non-linear	4.44
g. Explicit/Implicit	4.50
h. Terrell/Krasher	4.38

I have materials/activities to implement these theories in my classroom:

	Post
a. Piaget's reality	4.19
b. Hemisphericity	4.50
c. Lazanov	4.00
d. Asher	4.69
e. Winitz	4.13
f. Linear/Non-linear	4.50
g. Explicit/Implicit	4.50
h. Terrell/Krashen	4.38
i. Terrell (Binding)	3.88
Average	4.27

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges AUG 21 1987